To: Ball, Harold[Ball.Harold@epa.gov]

**Cc:** Minor, Dustin[Minor.Dustin@epa.gov]; Helmlinger, Andrew[Helmlinger.Andrew@epa.gov]; Maldonado, Lewis[Maldonado.Lewis@epa.gov]; Herrera, Angeles[Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov]; Seter, David[Seter.David@epa.gov]

From: Manzanilla, Enrique
Sent: Fri 1/29/2016 11:24:31 PM

Subject: Re: Emailing story: BC-NV--Toxic Nevada Mine-Superfund, 3rd Ld-Writethru

And we will be able to use them for press interviews.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 29, 2016, at 4:22 PM, Ball, Harold < Ball. Harold@epa.gov > wrote:

Agreed. Will work with team.

\_\_\_\_

Harold Ball, Chief, NV & Federal Facilities Section (S82), EPA Region 9 Superfund, w) 415.972.3047, c) 415.819.9821, <u>ball.harold@epa.gov</u>

From: Manzanilla, Enrique

Sent: Friday, January 29, 2016 3:19 PM

**To:** Ball, Harold < <u>Ball.Harold@epa.gov</u>>; Herrera, Angeles < <u>Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov</u>>;

Seter, David < Seter. David @epa.gov >

Cc: Minor, Dustin < Minor. Dustin@epa.gov>; Helmlinger, Andrew

< Helmlinger. Andrew@epa.gov >; Maldonado, Lewis < Maldonado. Lewis@epa.gov >

Subject: Fwd: Emailing story: BC-NV--Toxic Nevada Mine-Superfund, 3rd Ld-Writethru

In prep for the Wednesday call with amodei, it would be good to have some additional talking points that address some of the points in the governors letter. E.g., Carson river, urgency, wabuska, groundwater cleanup, current and potential future impacts to groundwater sources important for drinking water and AG, etc.

Can we do something like this? Just some bullets.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Herrera, Angeles" < Herrera. Angeles@epa.gov >

Date: January 29, 2016 at 3:46:47 PM MST

**To:** "PerezSullivan, Margot" < <u>PerezSullivan.Margot@epa.gov</u>> **Cc:** "Keener, Bill" < <u>Keener.Bill@epa.gov</u>>, "Manzanilla, Enrique"

< Manzanilla. Enrique@epa.gov >, "Ball, Harold" < Ball. Harold@epa.gov >, "Harris-

Bishop, Rusty" < Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov >

Subject: Re: Emailing story: BC-NV--Toxic Nevada Mine-Superfund, 3rd Ld-

Writethru

I think we should include it!

Please excuse my typos

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 29, 2016, at 3:41 PM, PerezSullivan, Margot < <a href="mailto:PerezSullivan.Margot@epa.gov">PerezSullivan.Margot@epa.gov</a>> wrote:

Folks, this is the story that will be published with or without our comment. Scott told me (see below) that he could write we had no immediate comment. However, we could say:

The EPA received the Governor's letter. The agency has been working with the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection for over 15 years on an alternative to listing the site on the National Priorities List. During that time, the EPA and NDEP have taken a variety of interim cleanup actions to protect public health and the environment. The agency remains committed to the complete cleanup of the Anaconda site.

Margot Perez-Sullivan U.S. Environmental Protection Agency D: 415.947.4149

C: 415.412.1115

E: perezsullivan.margot@epa.gov

From: Sonner, Scott [mailto:ssonner@ap.org]

Sent: Friday, January 29, 2016 2:37 PM

**To:** PerezSullivan, Margot < PerezSullivan. Margot@epa.gov>

Cc: Sonner, Scott < ssonner@ap.org>

Subject: Emailing story: BC-NV--Toxic Nevada Mine-Superfund, 3rd Ld-

Writethru

Drop dead deadline would be 5pm. This is latest version currently being edited.

For time being I could include that you guys are reviewing the govenor's response and had no immediate comment. Or just wait

Scott

Doc URL: <a href="http://elvisb.ap.org/News/Stories/CTCB-2016-Jan-29-000193/CTCB-2016-Jan-29-000193.docx">http://elvisb.ap.org/News/Stories/CTCB-2016-Jan-29-000193/CTCB-2016-Jan-29-000193.docx</a>

Slug: BC-NV--Toxic Nevada Mine-Superfund, 3rd Ld-Writethru

Headline: Sandoval: Nevada needs more time on mine Superfund status

Summary: Gov. Brian Sandoval says the state needs more time to decide whether to end its opposition to adding a toxic, abandoned mine in

western Nevada to a federal list of the most contaminated sites in the nation. Officials for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency notified Sandoval last month that if they didn't hear from him by Friday they'd formally propose as soon as March to put Yerington's former Anaconda copper mine on the Superfund's National Priority

List.

Extended Sandoval says state needs more time to decide whether to end its

Headline: opposition to adding a toxic, abandoned mine in western Nevada to

a federal list of the most contaminated sites in the nation

Editors Note: Eds: Expands to update with details, quotes, background; with AP

Photo

Urgency: Non Urgent

Byline: By SCOTT SONNER
Bytitle: Associated Press

Dateline: RENO, Nev.

Facing a deadline set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Gov. Brian Sandoval said Friday the state needs more time to decide whether to end its longheld opposition to adding a toxic, abandoned mine in western Nevada to a list of the most contaminated sites in the nation for fear it could give the local rural community a black eye.

EPA officials notified Sandoval last month that if they didn't hear from him by Friday they'd formally propose as soon as March placing Yerington's former

Anaconda copper mine on the Superfund's National Priority List, a move that would make it eligible for millions of federal dollars to begin cleanup.

The World War-II era mine is already a federal Superfund site, a designation that secured federal help with pinpointing the pollution's source and keeping it from spreading. Adding it to the priority list would make the mine eligible for federal funds to pay for 90 percent of the tens of millions of dollars needed to start cleaning up the site that was abandoned 16 years ago.

Sandoval said in a formal response to the EPA in a letter Friday afternoon he's not yet convinced such a listing is in the state's best interest given continued opposition from local residents who fear an adverse impact on property values and uncertainty over future availability of EPA funds.

"We continue to view NPL listing as an option of last resort," Sandoval wrote.
"I am assured by the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection that there are no imminent health concerns at the site that require immediate action."

Sandoval said there's no reason any formal rule-making can't be put off until September, and that he intends to provide his formal position on the matter at the end of April while the state continues to examine its options.

In 2013, rural neighbors of the mine won a \$19.5 million settlement from companies they accused of covering up the contamination of drinking water wells. EPA tests showed rural wells were tainted by uranium and other toxic chemicals that had leaked for decades from the mine about 70 miles southeast of Reno.

EPA regional administrator Jared Blumenfeld last month told Sandoval he needed to know by Jan. 29 whether the state has an alternative cleanup proposal. He said the agency is running out of time to get funding proposals in the pipeline and head off concern about the risk of hazardous chemicals escaping from the aging site in the next few years.

The mine covers 6 square miles of land owned partly by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management. Atlantic Richfield acquired the property in 1977 from Anaconda Copper, which built the mine in 1941.

Blumenfeld said the most immediate threat is the estimated 90 million gallons of acidic solution that the most recent owner of the site, Arimetco, left in the heap leach and fluid management system when it abandoned it in 2000.

"The reason for urgency is that funding needs to be in place well before the current pond capacity is exceeded," Blumenfeld wrote in a Dec. 22 letter. He said the situation demands constant management to avoid further leakage from the storage ponds, or an overflow.

"The consequence of either could result in significant additional threat to the Mason Valley Groundwater Basin," he said.

Construction on a remedy needs to start by summer 2019, Blumenfeld said.

The state projected last year it would cost \$30.4 million to address the most pressing concerns at the mine.

Sandoval acknowledged on Friday ``the need for a permanent closure of the Arimetco heaps.

"But not the dire nature of the situation and urgency conveyed in your letter," he wrote to EPA. "I have been advised that there is no critical reason to propose listing of the site in March, as you recommend, versus September 2016.